

Subject: Re: CPRA re City Attorney's Twitter account

From: [REDACTED]

Date: 2/21/19, 3:12 PM

To: Strefan Fauble <strefan.fauble@lacity.org>

Dear Mr. Feuer,

Can you state whether there are in fact muted accounts that you're refusing to produce or are you stating a hypo or are you going full Glomar?

Also, can you explain how a list of facts can be deliberative process? Can you state the decision that this list is predecisional with respect to?

Finally, can you explain how Twitter handles could be personal private information give that their creators have published them to the world already?

In short, can you please abandon this claim that a list of accounts muted by the City Attorney is exempt under any theory and just produce the information?

Thanks!

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: Strefan Fauble <strefan.fauble@lacity.org>

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 2:26 PM

Subject: CPRA re City Attorney's Twitter account

Dear [REDACTED]

This email is in response to your email of February 18 to the office of Los Angeles City Attorney Mike Feuer, seeking records under the California Public Records Act (CPRA) listing all of the City Attorney's official Twitter accounts and a list of accounts blocked or muted by those official Twitter accounts.

The City Attorney has one official Twitter account: <https://twitter.com/CityAttorneyLA>.

Please see the attached 3 records for the blocked accounts, which are all pornography and/or spam. Please be advised that any lists of muted accounts are deliberative-process privileged and thus exempt from production under Government Code section 6254(k), and also personal private information exempt from production under Government Code section 6254(c).

--

Strefan Fauble